

### **REMARKS**

As a preliminary matter, filed concurrently herewith is an Information Disclosure Statement that submits co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/621,889 (Attorney Docket No. 010355-9136) responsive to the Examiner's request. Also submitted by this Information Disclosure Statement is prior art which has not been previously considered in the instant application but submitted to date in the co-pending '889 application. Applicant respectfully requests acknowledgement of the references cited by returning an initialed and signed copy of the Information Disclosure Statement.

Applicant also respectfully requests a signed copy of the Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form (PTOL-413A).

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1 and 16 are currently amended to respectively include the features of cancelled claims 4 and 19. Claims 5 and 20 have been amended to depend from Claims 1 and 16, respectively. Claims 2, 3, 6-15, 17, and 18 are unchanged. Applicant's attorney appreciates the Examiner's time and consideration during the telephone interview on May 20, 2004. During the interview, Examiner James M. Hewitt and Applicant's attorney, Leon Nigohosian, Jr. (Registration No. 39,791) discussed the rejections in the present Office Action, the substance of which is provided below.

During the May 20, 2004 interview, the changes made by the foregoing amendment to independent Claims 1 and 16 were discussed. Additionally, the rejection of Claims 1/4 and 16/19 were discussed with respect to the Official Notice taken of the use of a fiberglass, an inert material of a combination thereof oriented circumferentially about a pipe or other tubular member to impart strength to and reinforce a member. Applicant's Attorney stated that the prior art does not teach or suggest the subject matter of independent Claim 1 or Claim 16, as amended, in which a reinforcement material is used in an insert (Claim 16) onto which a composition comprising at least one polymer is molded (Claim 1). Examiner Hewitt responded by stating the belief that prior art is readily available and that upon traversal by Applicant of the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice, documentary evidence would be

provided in the next Office Action as required by M.P.E.P Section 2144.03 (c). Accordingly, if the rejection is to be maintained, Applicant hereby respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice and requests documentary evidence to support the position taken by the ground of rejection.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under the prior art of record. Specifically, Claims 1-3, 6-7, 12-13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,664,958 ("Jones"). Claims 4-5, 8-9, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the foregoing and as explained in greater detail below.

Claim 1 discloses a method of manufacturing a flow connector, comprising providing at least one insert of a composition comprising at least one polymer and a reinforcement material selected from the group consisting of fiberglass, an inert material, and combinations thereof, the insert having a threaded bore for attachment to a threaded flow conduit, and molding onto the at least one insert a composition comprising at least one polymer to form a flow connector having a wall thickness defining an internal cavity and comprising at least one aperture defined by the at least one insert through the wall thickness.

Claim 16 discloses an insert for manufacturing a flow connector, comprising a threaded bore for attachment to a threaded flow conduit, the insert being of a composition comprising at least one polymer and a reinforcement material selected from the group consisting of fiberglass, an inert material, and combinations thereof.

Jones discloses a hollow thermoplastic drum 10 having an insert 15 positioned in one of the walls of the drum for receiving a threaded bung. The insert comprises a body of plastic material or metal such as steel or brass, high density polyethylene or nylon. As discussed with the Examiner during the May 20, 2004 interview, the prior art including Jones does not teach or suggest, among other things, an insert used in the manufacture of a flow connector in

which the insert comprises a reinforcement of fiberglass, an inert material, or combinations thereof. Nor is the method of manufacturing a flow connector and the flow connector produced by molding the reinforced insert into a composition comprising a polymer taught or suggested by the prior art including Jones.

For these and other reasons, Jones does not teach or suggest the subject matter of independent Claims 1 and 16. Dependent Claims 2, 3, 5-15 (which depend from independent Claim 1) and Claims 17, 18, and 20 (which depend from independent Claim 16) are allowable for the same and other reasons.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney regarding any further questions or to otherwise further discuss this application.

Respectfully submitted,

May 24, 2004  
Date

Leon Nigohosian, Jr.  
Reg. No. 39,791

Docket No.: 010355-9137  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108  
Phone: (610) 798-2176